referring to the Egyptian domination has been omitted, since Egypt was regarded by the Hebrew writer as a brother of Canaan. But we may gather that there was such a reference from the statement in the first quotation that Canaan should be subject to 'his brethren.' The reference would have come between vv.[26] and [27].

Yahweh is here stated to be 'the god of Shem'; see note on Gn 4[26]. The founder of the dynasty to which Khammu-rabi, 'king of the land of the Amorites,' belonged was Śamu-abi, 'Shem is my father.' As Ham was the father of Canaan, so Shem was the father of the Babylonian king.

The play upon the name of Japhet—'God shall make wide (the road) for Japhet'—is made to harmonize with the political situation at the time. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets we see the Hittites descending from Asia Minor upon Syria and Canaan, and the recently discovered tablets of Boghaz Keui complete the picture of the formation of their empire in Semitic lands. In the age of Ramses II. they were paramount in Aram, where they dwelt 'in the tents of Shem,' and Canaan had for some time been their 'servant.' Since the days when they invaded Babylonia and helped to overthrow the dynasty of Khammu-rabi, the road into the region of Shem had indeed been 'made wide' for them.

In these fragments of an old poem or poems there are no traces of a Babylonian original.

**28.** Cf. the title of the list of early Babylonian kings in the tablet which interprets their names, *annutum sarrê sa arki abubi*, 'these are the kings who were after the deluge.' As Noah was not a 'king'—the first king being Nimrod—he 'lived' only, and did not 'reign.'

# Contributions and Comments.

## 'Danaïds and Dirces' in the Epistle of Clement to Corinth.

ALL students of the Apostolic Fathers are familiar with the perplexing statement near the beginning of chap. vi. in the Epistle of Clement of Rome.

διὰ ζῆλος διωχθεῖσαι γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια παθοῦσαι, ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν, καὶ ἔλαβον γέρας γενναῖον, αἱ ἀσθενεῖς τῷ σώματι.

'It was by reason of jealousy that women being persecuted, after having suffered horrible and unholy outrages as Danaids and Dirces, attained to the sure course of faith and won a noble reward, weak though they were in body.'

'Attained to the sure course' is not a very obvious expression, and the exact meaning of it is not clear. Apparently it means the point in the race at which victory becomes sure, namely, the goal, or somewhere near the goal. The precise signification of the phrase is not of importance for understanding the sentence as a whole, but one would like to see what suggested the expression to Clement.

The difficulty of the passage, however, lies earlier in the sentence. What is the meaning of Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι as designating Christian women who suffered in the Neronian persecution? The words may be taken either with διωχθεῖσαι or with παθοῦσαι, and the meaning is much the same whichever construction we adopt.

The common explanation is that it refers to the monstrous practice, specially common under Nero and Domitian, of turning the punishment of criminals into dramatic scenes for the entertainment of the cruel by making the condemned person play the part of some sufferer in mythology. Lightfoot (*Clement of Rome*, ii. p. 32) gives illustrations. 'Thus one offender would represent Hercules burnt in the flames on Œta (Tertull. *Apol.* 15, *qui vivus ardebat Herculem induerat*); another, Ixion tortured on the wheel (*de Pudic.* 22, *puta in axe jam incendio adstructo*). We read also of criminals who, having been exhibited in the character of Orpheus (Martial. *Spec.* 21), or of Daedalus (*ib.* 8), or of Atys (Tertull. *Apol.* 15), were finally torn to pieces by wild beasts. The story of Dirce, tied by the hair and dragged along by the bull, would be very appropriate for this treatment; but all attempts to make anything of the legend of the Danaids entirely fail.' Renan, who again and again adopts this explanation as the right one (*L'Antechrist*, pp. 167, 169, 173, 182, 187), admits that *Il est difficile de dire en quoi la*

*fable des Danaïdes pouvait fournir un tableau sanglant* (p. 169). Dr. Chr. Wordsworth (*Conjectural Emendations*, p. 18) was of the same opinion: 'It is not easy to see how Christian women could be made to represent the punishment of the daughters of Danaus, fifty in number, drawing water in vessels pierced with holes, and to reproduce what Horace calls (3 *Carm.* iii. 15) *notas Virginum poenas et inane lymphae Dolium fundo pereuntis imo Seraque fata*; nor would such a penalty, exemplifying the efforts of fruitless labour, be ministerial to purposes of persecution.' He therefore rejected the established reading as a primitive error to be emended conjecturally. In his edition of Theocritus (Camb. 1844) he made the brilliant suggestion that instead of γυναῖκες Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκαι we ought to read γυναῖκες, νεανίδες, παιδίσκαι—'women, maidens, slave-girls.' The combination of the terms and the order in which they come are both of a very attractive character. The purpose of the chapter is to show that, in the persecutions, Christian women exhibited as much heroism as Christian men, and the three terms are all feminine and form a climax; not only adult women, but also tender maidens, and even slave-girls (whose surroundings are not such as to produce lofty characters), manifested this heroic endurance. Moreover, when written in uncials, the emendation does not differ widely from the established reading. The number of letters is the same, seventeen in all, and the majority of them remain unchanged: ΔΑΝΑΙΔΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΡΚΑΙ—ΝΕΑΝΙΔΕΣ ΠΑΙΔΙΣΚΑΙ. It is not incredible that, in the parent MS. from which our two Greek authorities and our two ancient versions (Syriac and Latin) are derived, the three words were substituted for the two. Strangely enough, in 1853 Mr. Basil H. Cooper, quite independently, suggested the same emendation in the *Monthly Christian Spectator*; and, when he heard of Wordsworth's emendation, was at first inclined to believe that it had been borrowed from himself.

This suggestion, thus doubly fathered, has met with much approval from competent judges; Baron Bunsen, in his *Hippolytus* (i. p. xviii, ed. 2, 1854), adopted it with delight, as freeing a beautiful passage from two monstrosities. Bishop Jacobson, in his *Patres Apostolici* (i. pp. 31, 32, ed. 4, 1863), declared it to be quite the best of the numerous emendations which had been proposed. Bishop Lightfoot, in his first edition of *Clement* (Macmillan, 1869), placed it in his text; in his second (1890) he restored and obelized the old reading, stating in his notes that he was 'disposed still to favour the acute emendation of Wordsworth.'

But there has not been general acceptation of it. Tischendorf thought it somewhat too free, *liberrima conjectura*. R. A. Lipsius, in reviewing Lightfoot's first edition in the *Academy* (July 9, 1870, p. 256), placed it among passages which 'are really improved in the new edition.' He praised it as a 'clever conjecture,' but he did not say that he believed it to be right. Donaldson thought it admirable; but in 1877 (*Theol. Rev.* Jan. p. 44) he proposed γενναῖαί τε καὶ δοῦλαι as perhaps better. Gebhardt and Harnack in their edition of the epistle (Lipsiae, 1876) retain the old reading, without mentioning Wordsworth's emendation, although they think it possible that the old reading is corrupt.

Perhaps the old reading would have been regarded with more favour if it had not been generally supposed that the only way in which Christian women could be made to act the part of the daughters of Danaus would be in having to carry water perpetually in vessels full of holes. That was the punishment inflicted upon them in Hades for having, in obedience to their father's command, murdered their husbands immediately after marriage. Why go to Hades for suggestions of torment, when human life is full of such things? It was in this world that Dirce was tied to a bull and dragged till she died, this being the vengeance which Amphion and his brother took for Dirce's cruel treatment of their mother Antiope. Hence the celebrated group known as the Farnese bull, the work of Apollonius and Tauriscus, now at Naples. In the stories about the lives of the daughters of Danaus we can find what would serve the persecutors' purpose, when they were looking for mythological precedents for αἰκίσματα δεινὰ καὶ ἀνόσια to be inflicted on Christian women. Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) tells us that there was a desire to inflict *ludibria*.

Danaus found that it was difficult to secure second husbands for the daughters who had obeyed him in killing their first bridegrooms, and Pindar (*Pyth.* ix. 117 f.) records how 'Danaus of Argos devised a *very speedy* wedding for his virgin daughters, ere midday had come upon them.' He placed all of them 'at the end of the race-course,' and declared that 'a contest of *speed*'

should decide which maiden each man should have who came as a suitor for them. Is it not possible that, in a similar way, Christian women and girls were exposed in the amphitheatre to be run for by the ruffians of Rome?

If we decide that the reading of the MSS and Versions is to be retained, and that the passage in Pindar gives the key to the right interpretation of 'Danaids,' namely, that Christian women were set up as prizes for those who chose to race for them in the amphitheatre, then we see how natural are the words that follow. Clement might no doubt quite readily have used metaphors taken from the racecourse, even if he had not just written something which reminded him of racing; but he would be specially likely to do so if he had been thinking of Christian women outraged by being given away as prizes to runners. There is little doubt that, when Pindar sang of 'a very speedy wedding' for the Danaids, he was thinking of the 'contest of speed' that was to decide whom each of them was to have as a husband; and it is not improbable that the thought of Christian women being raced for as prizes led Clement to speak of them as having 'attained to the sure course and received a noble reward.'

A. PLUMMER.

## Amos vi. 2.

THIS verse has been regarded as difficult, and many modern commentators consider it as a later insertion (see commentaries, especially Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1903, p. 154 f.; Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, 1904, p. 199; and Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, in 'The International Critical Commentary,' 1905, pp. 142, 144 ff.). It is held that the meaning of this verse is not clear, and that it interrupts the connexion of ideas between v.[1] and vv.[3ff.]. Two different interpretations have been given to this verse. One interpretation (given by Rashi and Kimhi, and followed, among moderns, by Ewald, Hitzig, Keil, Driver, and others) is that the prophet tells the nobles of Zion and Samaria to look round and to see whether any cities they know, as, for instance, the three cities mentioned in v.[2], are more flourishing than their own cities. The inference would then be: your prosperity is so great and still you have no fear of God. Against this interpretation it is objected that—(1) if the prophet had intended to point to the glory of other cities (or kingdoms) he would not have chosen as examples such small kingdoms as those mentioned in v.[2]; (2) 'these kingdoms' cannot mean Judah and Israel, but must refer to Calneh, Hamath, and Gath (see Nowack, Marti, Harper, and the commentators quoted by them). These objections are, indeed, difficult to overcome. Furthermore, would Amos have intended to say what this interpretation wants him to say, he would have expressed himself more clearly. Amos is sometimes very short. He sometimes uses phrases which are very pregnant, almost fragmentary. A gesture, a thought hinted at, is often part of a sentence. But Amos never expresses himself in a way which is unintelligible. Again, if Amos had meant what this interpretation suggests, we would have expected הטובים הם, or, still better, הטובות הן instead of הטובים. Then it is really impossible that הממלכות האלה should refer to Zion and Samaria. This interpretation must therefore be regarded as inadmissible.

The second interpretation is: Amos mentions the three cities as examples of fallen greatness. The prophet says: If these cities, which have been so flourishing, have fallen, you are sure to have the same end. Most of the modern commentators (Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, Harper, and others) favour this interpretation. They compare Nah 3[8ff.] and 2 K 19[13], where such ideas are expressed. Finding the wording of the verse too inconvenient for this interpretation, they insert אתם after הטובים and read אם רב נבלכם מנבולם instead of אם רב נבולם מנבלכם. But this interpretation, too, must be regarded as impossible. The text has not got אתם after הטובים, neither has it אם רב נבלכם מנבולם. The change is quite arbitrary and unwarranted. But, quite apart from this textual objection, can it be seriously assumed that the prophet (or, if it is an insertion, any other Hebrew writer) would have expressed himself so obscurely? The passages which are compared have that idea clearly stated. Cf. Nah 3[8. 9. 10. 11]. There the fate of the cities mentioned as examples is stated. The same is the case in 2 K 19[11-13]. But our verse has not the slightest reference to such an idea as that suggested by this interpretation. There are also historical difficulties, for which see Driver, *The Books of Joel and Amos*, p. 192. This interpretation must therefore also be rejected.

It occurs to me, however, that the verse has been made more difficult than it really is. I believe

that the following interpretation, which I venture to suggest, furnishes a satisfactory sense for the verse as it stands.

The whole section (vv.[1-7]) is addressed by the prophet to the nobles of Zion and Samaria. According to the two explanations mentioned above, v.[2] would be an exception and therefore form a break between v.[1] and vv.[3ff.]. This is the main cause of all the difficulties found in this verse (see Harper, *l.c.*). In vv.[1. 3. 4. 5. 6] the idleness, injustice, and luxury of those nobles are described, and in v.[7] their fate (captivity) is announced. V.[2] interrupts the course of ideas. Now it appears to me that v.[2] also deals with the state of the nobles. In v.[1a] the nobles are described as being 'at ease in Zion, and secure in the mountain of Samaria.' In v.[1b] they are called 'the men of mark of the first of the nations, to whom the house of Israel come (for judgment, for guidance).' Now the prophet tells these nobles in v.[2] that in Calneh, Hamath the great, and Gath of the Philistines, *they will not find greater nobles than they are.* In v.[2] the prophet justifies his calling them נקבי ראשית הגוים, and thus amplifies what he said about them in v.[1]. Go to these other kingdoms, he tells them, and see whether their nobles have larger estates than you have, whether their prosperity is greater than your prosperity. V.[2] is then to be translated in this way:

'Pass over to Calneh and see, and go thence to Hamath the great (and see), and go down to Gath of the Philistines (and see) the good (prosperous) ones (*i.e.* the nobles) of these kingdoms (and see) whether their border (their estates) is greater than your border (your estates).'

V.[2] is thus merely a continuation of v.[1]. Far from being an interruption 'in the transition of thought from v.[1] to v.[3]' (Harper), it is an amplification of the ideas expressed in v.[1]. Thus *all* the six verses ([1-6]) contain a description of the prosperity, hardness, and luxury of the nobles of Judah and Israel.

I take the ה of הטובים as an article, and טובים as a designation of the nobles of those three kingdoms (מן הממלכות האלה). The Septuagint, the Syriac translation, and the Vulgate, also take the ה in הטובים as an article. Only they refer טובים to the kingdoms, which is unsatisfactory. But they thus give to הטובים the same meaning as I give: the prosperous ones. I refer טובים to the nobles (of those kingdoms). No objection can be raised to this use of the word טובים. הטובים מן הממלכות האלה is a phrase parallel to השאננים בציון והבטחים בהר שמרון. וראו has naturally to be supplemented mentally, as indicated in my translation. As to the correctness of אם (without preceding ה) see Kautzsch's edition of Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik* (1902), p. 483. No grammatical or linguistic difficulties, therefore, stand in the way of my explanation of v.[2].

According to my explanation all exegetical difficulties disappear, the text remains intact, the sense is entirely satisfactory, and the verse ([2]) is seen to be an integral part of the whole section ([1-7]), the meaning of which is now perfectly clear.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

*Jews' College, London.*

## Σαββατισμός.

HE $3^7$–$4^{13}$ is generally recognized as an intricate passage. The course of thought reminds one of a stream that occasionally flows underground. Thus something disappears from our view between $4^7$ and $4^8$. The general argument of the preceding verses turns upon the unbelief of the Israelites in their wanderings through the wilderness. It takes a fresh start from $4^6$, 'Seeing therefore it remaineth that some should enter into (God's rest), and they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in . . . he again defineth a certain day, saying in David, after so long a time, To-day . . . if ye shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts.' The passage 'in David' (Ps 95) is said to be a lyric of 'Israel's Renaissance' (A. B. Davidson)—the period of the Return, and to tell of a second national day of grace when a land of promise was again offered to God's people. It is possible, however, seeing that the LXX, which the author of Hebrews here mainly follows, ascribes the Psalm to David that the reference in the Epistle is indeed to the brilliantly idealized period of the early monarchy, and to the opportunity supposed to have been granted to Israel at that time of rising to a truly religious vocation. However that may be, the main point of these verses is the non-fulfilment of God's purpose in offering His Rest to the Israel of the Exodus, and the consequent reservation of that Rest to some later day. It is here that the stream of the writer's thought dives underground. Apparently there

came into his mind the recollection that after all, though 'they to whom the good tidings were before preached failed to enter in,' their children with Caleb and Joshua did enter in—at least to the land which had been promised as a land of rest. It was written in Joshua in respect to the final settlement after the actual entering, 'So the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest (LXX—κατέπαυσεν) round about according to all that he sware unto their fathers,' etc. ($21^{43}$). And again, later ($23^{1}$), a κατάπαυσις had been distinctly associated with the leadership of Joshua. These explicit statements seemed to cut the ground from under the feet of our author, who, as we have seen ($4^{6}$), had found the promised rest open to Christians because none before them had entered thereinto. He was led, therefore, to reveal his meaning by an uplifting movement of thought that disentangled his idealism from the associations of the old record. With grave boldness he moves forward upon a contradiction of the letter of Scripture, saying, 'For if Joshua had given them rest, he (God) would not have spoken afterward (in David) of another day.' Then to justify his interpretation of the past, and to differentiate his ideal conception from any attainments ascribed to Joshua, he concludes by flashing upon us a word which to his readers must have been practically new. 'There remaineth therefore a *sabbath* rest (σαββατισμός) for the people of God.' The change from κατάπαυσις to σαββατισμός brilliantly lights up the whole passage. Perhaps it could be said that Joshua did give to those he led a κατάπαυσις. He certainly did not give a σαββατισμός. What was the difference between the two things?

σαββ. is found in the N.T. only here, nowhere in LXX, and only in one place in classical Greek. We have, however, in one of the Oxyrhynchus Logia a sentence which its editors (Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, *Sayings of our Lord*, p. 11) suggest as relevant to the verse under discussion: ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα ('Except ye truly keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father'). A study of the whole logion, of which this is the second part, conveys the impression that σαββατίζειν τὸ σάββατον is here metaphorical, and that the logion means that 'the Christian's whole life is to be hallowed, as a Sabbath, in the service of God.' I quote from Dr. Driver's note in *D.B.* iv. p. 323. Dr. Swete, in an address published in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (viii. 546), takes the same view, which I cannot see is weakened by the contrary judgment of another writer in the succeeding volume of this journal (pp. 141–142). Now the significance of the phrase in the logion for the interpretation of σαββ. in He $4^{9}$ lies in its agreement with those sacramental ideas belonging to the whole Epistle which Professor Nairne has so brilliantly set before us in his work, *The Epistle of Priesthood*. We are enabled thereby to understand better the author's thought in regard to the Rest Israel failed to win. It sends us back to re-examine the original conception of the land of promise. Take, *e.g.*, Dt $12^{9\text{-}12}$. (We are not concerned with any Pentateuchal criticism, for this was not before the mind of the writer of the Epistle.) In such words as these—'Ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance. . . . When he giveth you rest,' etc., the idea is not merely a rest of settled politics, but of established and institutionalized religion. 'The irregular, arbitrary worship of the wilderness is not to continue indefinitely' (Driver, *in loc.*). The whole experience of Israel in the Providence that should bring her into Canaan, and especially in the worship which was then to be set up on a more glorious basis than had before been possible, was to be sacramental to her. The things that were external—the end of battle, the settled land, the ordered worship—were to be signs and seals of an invisible grace, through which God should be revealed afresh, while the grateful love of Israel to God would be her contribution to a real and intimate communion. Broadly speaking, we may say the outward elements taken alone made up the κατάπαυσις, the inward, with these, the σαββατισμός.

Now that even the Israel, which had been disciplined into some measure of faith through the wilderness wanderings, failed to receive the σαββ. was just part of that failure of all the O.T. economy of which Hebrews is full. So the unattained heavenly reality was reserved for those who should become 'partakers of Christ' ($3^{14}$).

One remaining question may be considered. How precisely are we to interpret this σαββ.? The words which immediately follow $4^{9}$, connecting back with $4^{4}$, seem to involve a very primitive idea of the Rest. It is a cessation from work, as God rested from His. But we may feel sure our

author would not be content with a literalism. The rest after creation came when God had seen that all was very good. It was a rest not so much *from* activity as *in* accomplishment. It reminds us of the exquisite word in Zephaniah—'He will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing' ($3^{17}$). It had in it something corresponding to that conception of fruition which Eucken and his disciples have made familiar to us, the idea of a life which in its strength and joy gathers up the significance of a realized end. And it is this blessedness of an eternal world, ungiven by Joshua, that remains for the people of God who are in Christ. One can see the moral of this line of the writer's thinking all the more clearly when we remember the dangers that beset his first readers in their hankering after Levitical ritual and an institutionalized kingdom —dangers which in other forms are always with ourselves and from which only a Christ-dominated sacramentalism can set us free.

A. D. MARTIN.

*Edinburgh.*

## Thoughts on Prayer.

WHAT is prayer? Many definitions might be given, but in all we should find that every prayer supposes two parties, one in need of something, and the other possessing the power to grant it. The prayer is uttered by the one in need to the one in power.

By this definition it would follow that if God wanted something from man, which man had the power to grant, then God might pray to man. Does He ever do so? If so, it goes far to prove the truth of the definition.

St. Paul says: 'Now then, as ambassadors for Christ, as THOUGH GOD DID BESEECH YOU by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.'

Again God says by Isaiah: 'All the day long have I stretched out mine hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.'

So in the one thing man can grant or refuse, God condescends to pray to man.

But let us see what else is implied by prayer.

*First*, the existence of both parties is assumed. No one will pray to an abstraction. A man must believe that the object of his prayer exists before he can pray.

*Second*, it is assumed that the object of the prayer can hear the prayer. Otherwise it is no use praying.

*Third*, that he can understand the language used.

*Fourth*, that he has power to grant the request.

These four postulates are essential. Without them there can be no prayer.

But granting all these, although there may be prayer—as when one prays to a hard-hearted tyrant to spare some victim; praying it, yet not expecting it; taking an off-chance, as it were—unless we have more than our four postulates require, it will be cold, hopeless, ineffective prayer.

What, then, do we want more?

*Fifth*, a knowledge that the object of prayer is not only powerful but kind. If we could hear of other petitions He has answered, we shall present ours more hopefully.

*Sixth*, an encouraging word. If the object of prayer, for example, has said that we may present our petition. That very permission to present it, is in itself an assurance that the object of the prayer is favourably disposed to us, and that possibly He will grant our request.

*Seventh*, a promise. But this will be valuable or not according to the honesty of the object of the prayer. If he be a rogue, a crafty person, or a tyrant, he may even break a promise. So we need to know—

*Eighth*, that He is true and faithful.

So we need to be assured of the following things before we can effectually pray:—That the object of our prayer exists: that He can grant our prayer; that He keeps His word. Then, that He is willing to hear; ready to give and forgive; and that He has promised something.

But there is another thing needed also before prayer can be efficacious, namely, that we, on our part, REALLY WANT what we ask for. If we do not feel our need, we shall not be earnest in our prayer, for whom, or for whatever we make it.

These being the essentials, we may say that prayer to God demands FAITH—that is, a firm belief in the existence and power of God—for apart from this we shall never approach Him. And secondly, a deep sense of need, for without this we shall not be in earnest.

Then, some promise that He will hear, and some PLEDGE of His willingness. On such a pledge, we

think, our faith might be strong enough. Well, here it is: 'He that spared not *his own Son*, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?' Our pledge of what He will do is simply what He has done.

It will be noticed that I have nowhere said that emotion is required. No: for, though it frequently accompanies prayer, emotion is not prayer.

Prayer is a petition presented to one powerful enough to grant it, and effectual prayer is that same petition presented in the full assurance that He will grant it. 'Whatsoever things ye ask for, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them,' said our Lord. And this saying is absolutely true, just as true as it is that a favourite son will get whatever he asks from his father. That is, he will get it, if it is not bad for him to have it. A father, for instance, would hardly give his little son a razor however hard he begged. It might grieve him to refuse, but his love for his son would override the son's prayer. We shall assuredly have 'whatsoever things we ask for' so long as infinite love and wisdom does not see that they would injure us. A child asks for cake and has some; asks for more and is told: 'You have had enough! more would be bad for you.' That does not hinder the fact of WILLINGNESS to grant, nor can this be called an unanswered prayer. It is answered by a denial kinder than the granting would be. Nor does the denial hinder the child's next petition, for he realizes that he WOULD HAVE HAD THE CAKE if he could without being made ill.

We need sometimes to realize this with God.

What, then, is prayer? It is the answer to God's prayer, for it is just the being reconciled to God and so bringing our wants to Him as any child does to its parents; sure we shall get what we want, so far as love and willingness goes, but not sure so far as infinite knowledge and wisdom goes. But trusting that wisdom, and so loving and trusting God whether He give, or whether He withhold.

EDWARD METCALFE.

# Entre Nous.

**German Spiritual Music.**

Canon Scott Holland, who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, has been contributing papers on the War to the *Commonwealth*, of which he is the editor. These papers he has now collected into a volume with the title *So as by Fire* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net). There are Politics, Doctrine, Philosophy, and other things in them, and there is something else in this paper on

GERMAN SPIRITUAL MUSIC.

'There is only one thing to be done during this disastrous strife. Whenever you have read your papers, and have been reduced to a carnivorous fury by hideous tales of outrage and horror, you open your piano, and you begin to play tunes out of the most beautiful, and tender, and beseeching book in the whole wide world—"Das Deutsche Geistliche Lied"—the Collection of German religious music down the centuries. There are six little paper volumes of them—and they begin with a Hymn of Caelius Sedulius, with words by Martin Luther: and they come right down, through all the superb royalties of John Sebastian and Philip Emmanuel Bach, to Schubert, and Mendelssohn, and friends of yesterday. Was there ever music like it, to wind into your very heart of hearts? These cuddling, crooning, Cradle-Songs in which Mary begs the dear Joseph to rock the child, or gather the hay for its pillow—they have in them the very soul of Germany—homely, motherly, sentimental, soft, delicious! There is song after song of this cradle-lilt: and, then, there are others which sing of Jesus, the babe, who will lie in our bosom, and be sung to sleep, with refrains of "Eia! Eia!" They seem to well up out of the very depth of loving motherhood. They rise and fall like a mother's breathing breast. They coo with the pleading sing-song of a brooding nurse. And, then, there are Shepherds calling to their goats, winning them by tender-hearted echoes to the safe sweet pastures. And there is solemn music from Hans Sachs, and Corner, and Crüger, for Sunday twilight over the wood fire: and folk-songs that have in them the strange soft pathos of buried peoples, who have lived in quiet forgotten places: and there is always Franck, and the great Sebastian, to kindle and to awe. It is a world of